

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
NORTHERN DIVISION

EDWARD EARL THOMAS

Plaintiff,

v.

Honorable David M. Lawson
Case No. 05-X-10231-BC

BAY CITY HOUSING COMMISSION

Defendant,

-and-

EDWARD EARL THOMAS,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No. 05-X-10232-BC

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY,

Defendant,

-and-

EDWARD EARL THOMAS,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No. 05-X-10233-BC

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

Defendant.

_____ /

ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION

On June 27, 2005, the plaintiff, Edward Earl Thomas, presented three complaints together with three motions to proceed *in forma pauperis*. Because the plaintiff's complaints did not make out a coherent cause of action, his applications for *in forma pauperis* status were denied on September 2, 2005.

On September 26, 2005, the plaintiff submitted three motions for reconsideration of the

Court's previous rulings. The Local Rules of this Court permit a party to file a motion for reconsideration of a ruling within ten days after its entry by the Court. Such a motion will be granted only if the movant identifies a "palpable defect" in this court's disposition of the case. E.D. Mich. LR 7.1(g)(3). A "palpable defect" is a one that is obvious, clear, unmistakable, manifest, or plain. *Fleck v. Titan Tire Corp.*, 177 F. Supp. 2d 605, 624 (E.D. Mich. 2001). Here, the Court will deny the motion because the plaintiff has not shown a palpable defect in the Court's order.

Accordingly, it is **ORDERED** that the plaintiff's motions for reconsideration [dkt # 3] is **DENIED**.

s/David M. Lawson
DAVID M. LAWSON
United States District Judge

Dated: October 6, 2005

PROOF OF SERVICE

The undersigned certifies that a copy of the foregoing order was served upon each attorney or party of record herein by electronic means or first class U.S. mail on October 6, 2005.

s/Tracy A. Jacobs
TRACY A. JACOBS